



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

No. IX.

JUNE, 1836.

ARTICLE I.

REMARKS ON OCCASION OF COMMENCING A
SECOND VOLUME.

BY THE EDITOR.

IT is now two years since the first number of this work was issued from the press. The eighth, and last number, completed the first volume, and with the present number the second volume begins.

The origin of the work, as well as of others devoted to the same express object, may be attributed to an increasing tendency in the spirit of the age towards a pacific policy. General measures having for their avowed purpose the promotion of peace, are a phenomenon peculiar to modern times. Antiquity knew nothing of the kind. The current of affairs ran strongly adverse to the cultivation of justice and good will between nations.

Amid the elements of violence on which the earliest monarchies were founded, where whole nations were conquered, and transplanted entire, to minister to the pride of the conqueror, and he a despot at whose nod enslaved millions bowed.

VOL. II. No. 9.

1

Peace if she could have spoken, would never have been heard. The colossal piles of Egypt, Nineveh, and Babylon, show the desire of physical aggrandizement to have been the reigning passion of the age. In the later, but not less gigantic empire of Macedon, efforts in behalf of peace, would have been a phenomenon more remarkable than the tears of him who wept that the limits of the known world, were the limits of victory and conquest.

And what shall we say of the polished states of Greece ; where stranger and enemy were synonymous, and all moral obligation, between nations, regarded as consisting in compact ? The Greeks, though unacquainted with the diffusion of knowledge through the press, yet, possessed in the public assemblies of the people, and in the schools of the philosophers, something like a substitute. But in these assemblies, where historians and poets recited and were crowned, where heroes and their achievements were extolled, was there ever a voice heard descanting on the virtues of peace, and inviting the people to cultivate her gentle, yet powerful arts ? Where in all Greece, when the genius of her people poured forth its brightest splendours, were topics like these, ever illumined and adorned by their light ? Not even in the groves of the Academy, nor in the porticos of Athens, amid all the high discourse of the Grecian sages, were the moral duties of nations to each other, ever made the express theme. If we may mention the public monuments and pictures of a people as any index to the general taste, among the ornaments which adorned the *Pæcile*, one of the chief places of public resort in Athens, was a picture of *captive Trojan women*, and among them the figure of *Cassandra bound*, designed it would seem, to perpetuate the memory of military triumph over female helplessness, and purity !

With the Romans, virtue, in its primitive sense, signified *heroic* qualities, and the terms which denoted man (*vir*), and physical force (*vis*), were of kindred origin. Peace (*pax*)*

* Derived from the verb *pango*, to make an agreement.

denoted *compact*, as if the obligation of nations to remain at peace, rested on no higher ground than mere agreement. But the character of the Roman people is not left to be ascertained by doubtful etymologies. History abundantly attests that war was the general business of the state, and peace the interval of leisure ; war the general rule, and peace the exception. In a nation like this, which carried its arms wherever its name had been able to penetrate, so that whatever people had heard of their terrour, also felt their power, it was vain to talk of peace.

The Hebrew nation were invested with a divine commission to subdue, or to exterminate the gentile nations, as a necessary means, in the order of Providence, for establishing and preserving themselves ; a seed in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed. The heathen raged, and the Lord of Hosts himself led on the battle against them, that the things which they imagined against his people, might be rendered vain.—There seemed to be nothing in the whole compass of the moral agencies known to antiquity, which could tame the fierce spirit of the nations.

With the Christian religion, as it were a new element descended on the earth, destined, to blend with the other elements of society, and to mould them at its will. Then it began to be proved that moral causes are stronger than material force. The iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, began to be broken in pieces ; and the process will continue, until they become as the chaff of the summer threshing floor, and the wind shall carry them away. With the introduction of the Christian religion, the *selfish principle*, on which all social institutions were based, began to yield. The pride of the Jew was humbled with the dust, and his boasting rendered vain. He was distinctly taught that God, who had made of one blood all nations of men, to dwell on the face of the whole earth, was no respecter of persons. In the light of Christianity, the polished Greek, and the rude barbarian, stood on equal ground ; and the imperial majesty which seemed inherent in the idea of a *Roman citizen*, vanished.

Jew or Gentile, Greek or barbarian, citizen or alien, bond or free, it mattered not, all were equally subjects of the divine regard, all equally susceptible of moral obligation, and all equally bound to the duties of Christian love and charity towards each other. The principles of self denial too, and of self sacrifice, were substituted for that of self indulgence, and man taught to look not on his own things only, but also on the things of others. All other rules of action were to be discarded, and Christian love to be the predominating principle of human intercourse. In the light of Christianity, man saw the dignity of his nature, and in learning to respect himself, learned also to respect others. The light of mere knowledge could civilize and elevate, to some extent, a favoured few ; with the Christian religion, arose a universal light, shining alike on the high and the low, on the evil and the good.

The effects of Christianity on social institutions, wherever it has operated, have been just what its elementary principles would lead us to anticipate. Christianity has been the great civilizer of the nations. The sun lightens not a spot on the face of the entire globe, where civilization exists without Christianity. Other causes have, indeed operated, but Christianity seems to have been that leading cause, that main agency without which all the others would have been fruitless. It has meliorated the social relations of mankind as members of families and of nations ; elevating woman from the slave of man, to be his companion, rendering man a better husband, father, and brother, woman a better wife, sister, and mother,—making better neighbours, and better citizens,—and infusing into the laws of states principles of humanity and justice, unknown before. But it has not stopped here. Beginning where all charity begins, it has extended the circle of its influence to the remoter relations which exist between men as members of different nations. This influence has hitherto been, in the main, an indirect and silent influence, but it is no longer so. Within the last twenty-five years, a course of systematic and specific action has arisen, in England, France, Switzerland, and America, having for its express object the

melioration of international relations. A cause of a novel and before unheard of character, has appeared, designated, and beginning to be generally known, as the *cause of peace*. The very existence of this cause seems to us an omen of its success. We believe it to be not only in conformity with the tendencies of the age, but a natural result of causes which, under the predominating influence of Christianity, have long been in operation. If such be the fact—if the cause of peace be a result of the influence mainly of the Christian religion, and now assuming a distinct shape only to operate with greater power, it will certainly prevail. Encumbered, and embarrassed it may be; it cannot be extinguished. There is within it a celestial vigour which will work it free, impel it onward with a constantly accelerated force, until at length its triumph shall be complete. *The position occupied by the advocates of the cause of peace is, therefore, one of confidence.*

It is also one of high moral elevation.—If we regard the magnitude of the object to be accomplished, we cannot fail to perceive the grandeur of the enterprize. It has been estimated, that within the last four thousand years, seven times the number of the present population of the globe (900 millions) have been destroyed by war. Add to this destruction of life, the wretchedness occasioned to the survivors, the capital and property of different kinds annihilated; then look at the moral aspects of the subject; and following out each of these particulars into the details, you will be able to form some notion of the magnitude of the object to be accomplished by abolishing war. We would by no means depreciate other benevolent enterprizes, but what enterprize, with reference to the magnitude of the result contemplated, can be compared to this? If the African slave trade be an object to excite the abhorrence of the civilized world, what shall we say of a custom by which, not the liberties of a single people, in a single quarter of the globe, and that for the space of a few hundred years, have been invaded, but by which millions of *lives*, in all nations, in all quarters of the globe, and in all ages of the world, have miserably

perished? What shall we say of the magnitude of an evil so vast, that its increase seems to make it nothing more, its decrease, nothing less? If the slave trade be an object to excite the abhorrence of the civilized world, where shall men, when they shall awake to behold the enormity of the practice of settling national differences by the mangling of human bodies, and the shedding of human blood, where, shall they find language, to express their unmingled horror? The Congress of Vienna, composed of the representatives of the great powers of Europe, exhibited a sublime moral spectacle, when they declared in the face of Europe, and of the world, that the African slave trade had been regarded by just and enlightened men, in all ages, as repugnant to the principles of humanity, and of universal morality, and that the public voice, in all civilized countries, demanded that it should be suppressed. How much more sublime will be the spectacle, when the nations of Europe and America, deeply penetrated with the atrocity of deciding national differences by an arbitrament of blood and slaughter, shall solemnly declare, in the face of Europe and of the world, that it is a practice repugnant to the principles of humanity and of universal morality, and how loudly and unceasingly will the public voice demand that it shall be suppressed! The enterprise is indeed great, the theme inspiring. What greater curse than war; what greater good than peace? Peace seems to have been chosen as the term fittest to denote the blessings of Christianity, both in their beginning, and in their fulness; its first announcement was made by proclaiming peace on earth, and its final triumph is designated as the *reign of peace*.

But however great may be the enterprise, it is often asserted to be utterly impracticable. That independent nations, having no common umpire, must in case of difference, resort to the sword, is a remark so commonly and so frequently made, that it seems to have worn upon the mind, an impression of its truth, by the mere force of repetition. It is, however, founded in ignorance of the ultimate principles on which tribunals of law,

reason, and equity, are based. Why, we might ask, do not individuals settle their differences sword in hand, instead of submitting them to the decision of a court? Because, it will be replied, there is a law which takes such cases out of the hands of individuals, and provides for their reference to a court. But what *gives force* to that law? The arm of the magistrate, will be the answer. But what makes the arm of the magistrate so strong that it can give force to a law over thousands and millions of men, each of whom has an arm as strong as the magistrate himself? What magic is there in the black headed staff of the constable, that the stoutest and most resolute offenders against the law, flee before it, rather than attempt resistance? What secret charm in the voice of the sheriff, that when opposed, he can call for aid, and the *posse comitatus* will rally around him, and men with powder and ball, and bristling bayonets, stand ready to enforce his orders? Oh! it will be said, it is the *law*, it is the *law* which does all this. But what is this law, which is so omnipotent? What gives such power to a silent letter on the statute book, or to a rule existing no where but in the minds of men, or in the reported decisions of the courts. We answer, what but the universal conviction, that the law once prostrate, violence will prevail, and society become a scene of universal anarchy? 'This it is which makes men rally around the law. The combined will, the common sentiment of the people, is what gives force to law. Every offender knows that if one man, by his single arm, is unable to execute her mandate, another will come to his aid, and another, and another, until enough are collected to compel obedience. Force may be sometimes necessary; but behind this force lies the collected will of the nation; once let this will be broken, society dissolves into its original elements, and primeval darkness returns to brood over the wildest chaos.

Thus it appears that the mode of adjusting differences between individuals in civil society, derives its efficacy from a universal, abiding conviction of the necessity of such a mode in order to prevent universal ruin. When the nations shall be-

come fully awake to the nature of war as a mode of deciding national differences, and shall be fully and permanently convinced what benefits will be derived from administering international law, through the medium of tribunals analgous to those which administer it between man and man, what shall hinder that law from being guarded by sanctions as efficient as those which give force to the laws of states, and *violence* between nations from being reprobated equally with violence between citizens?

There is another topic sometimes insisted on in discouragement of efforts in behalf of peace, which, although we have dwelt upon it at length in former articles, we are unwilling to pass over, without remark; and the more unwilling, since recent occurrences shed upon it the light of a living comment. We refer to the *necessity* of war. When the French government refused to pay the indemnity due us by treaty, it was loudly proclaimed that the honour of our country, and justice to the claimants of the money, demanded the most decided measures, and those of a *warlike* character. It was not to be endured, it was said, that we should have been negotiating with France for a quarter of a century, and have been unable to obtain the payment. On this subject it is not our design to enlarge. We have called the attention of our readers to it merely for the purpose of laying before them a single fact, which sets the whole matter in a clearer light than any words of ours could do.

“Towards the close of the last century, the United States and France being in amity, while Europe was engaged in a general war, our merchants availed themselves of their neutral position to make large shipments, principally of provisions for the belligerents. This they were entitled to do, not only by the general law of nations, but also by the special stipulations of our treaties with France. But the war soon assumed a character in which all rules of intercourse were disregarded; the laws of nations and the obligations of treaties, were openly violated, and, by a series of outrages unparalleled in the history of modern times, both the belligerents, and especially France,

nearly destroyed our commerce, and ruined those who were engaged in it. Our merchants complained, and our government remonstrated, but without effect. It is no doubt the duty of every government to protect its citizens, and if possible procure redress for injuries done to them. In performance of this duty, the government of the United States invited its citizens to confide their claims to its management, and undertook to do every thing in its power to obtain satisfaction. They did so, and left the matter to their government, in the confidence that justice would be done. Our ministers were instructed to demand of France, indemnity for those injuries; and, at last, a special mission was sent to insist upon redress. The French government did not deny the justice of the demand; but they had claims upon the government of the United States, which they insisted upon taking into consideration, and they refused to enter into any agreement unless those claims were provided for. The negotiation on these points was protracted for a long time, and finally, the United States agreed not merely to abandon, but to *release* the claims of our merchants to indemnity, on condition that France would relinquish her claims upon us. This agreement was completed by the Convention of the 30th of September, 1800, and the just claims of our merchants upon the government of France, were exchanged by our government, for a national object, which was deemed a full equivalent. Under these circumstances, the individuals, whose rights were thus bartered, ask of our government some compensation for their property, which has thus been used for the public good; on the principle that they alone ought not to bear the whole loss of what was given to France as an equivalent for an object of great national importance.”*

The facts of this statement are abundantly proved by authentic documents; they are within the recollection of many; and upon the minds of some, indelibly impressed. The amount of the claims was estimated at *fifteen millions* of dollars, and our government in assuming them in discharge of claims of a

* See American Quarterly Review—Art. French Spoiliations prior to 1800—President’s Message of May 20th, 1836, and sundry Reports of Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

like amount, made by the French government, showed its own sense of their value. Immediately after the Convention of 1800, the claimants petitioned Congress for payment, and they have continued to do so up to the present hour. And what has been the result? Not a solitary cent have they obtained. The sense of justice and the generous sympathies so easily aroused by the delay of France, for a quarter of a century, to discharge a similar claim, have slumbered over this debt of our own government for the period of *thirty-six* years. Committee after committee have reported in favour of the claimants; four out of five committees, since the year 1826, have done so; and still justice is withheld.

Now we have adduced these facts *simply* because they illustrate, in reference to a single case, that of the non-payment of a debt, the nature of the necessity of war. The ultimate refusal of France to pay the indemnity, it was supposed would make a resort to war necessary. It was not to be endured that we should have been negotiating about the payment, a quarter of a century, and not have been able to obtain it. With equal propriety might our citizens, adopting similar language, declare, it is not to be endured that we should have been petitioning the government for thirty-six years, and have yet been unable to obtain payment. And who can say that they could not have made out a case of equal necessity, both in order to satisfy their injured honour and their injured purses, of rushing sword in hand, to make reprisals upon the public property of the nation? We say nothing of the madness and the guilt of such an act; we simply say that it was equally as *necessary* as would have been the making of reprisals on the property of French subjects, or of the French government. With what show of propriety, the President of the United States, in his message, could complain of the injustice of France to our citizens, in withholding from them *five* millions of dollars for a period of *twenty-five* years, without assuming a tone equally decided in regard to the injustice of our own government in withholding from them

fifteen millions of dollars, for the period of *thirty-six* years, we are entirely unable to conceive.*

There is another subject whose bearings upon this matter of the *necessity* of war, we will allude to, and then draw our remarks to a close.

In a time of general tranquillity, we are suddenly shocked with the intelligence of barbarous outrages committed on the persons and property of our fellow-citizens, by savage Indian tribes. Stung to the madness of despair, they are disencumbering themselves of every embarrassment, murdering even their own infants in order to be free from their charge, and resolved to sell their lives as dearly as possible. It must not be supposed that Indian tribes, dwelling within the territories of the United States, are unacquainted with the power of our government. The lesson which our government seems to have been mainly anxious to impress upon their minds, is the lesson of its power. Savages as they are, they possess a natural acuteness, which has led them to calculate the consequences of a conflict with the United States. They know they are engaged in a struggle in which they must ultimately be subdued, it may be, exterminated. The principal chief of the Seminoles is said to have stated how long he expects to be able to hold the government of the United States at bay.

It is natural to inquire what can have aroused these savages to enter into so desperate a conflict. We are at peace with other nations ; they cannot have been instigated by the arts, or bribed by the rewards of white men. We must look for the cause of their hostility in something which concerns their relations to the United States. What this something is, has not, although the war has now been raging about six months, been made the subject of any public official communication between the different departments of our government. In the silence of the government, the people of the United States are left to gather from

* It will be distinctly observed that the injustice of our government in withholding the payment of the claims in question, is not chargeable on any *one* administration or any *one* political party, but upon *all* parties and upon *all* the Congresses of the United States for *thirty-six* years.

the reports of individuals and from their own surmises, what may have been the origin of the war. Report says that a most iniquitous treaty has been made between the commissioners of the United States and certain Indian chiefs who were not authorized to make such a treaty, and whom the commissioners knew to be unauthorized to make it. By this treaty these chiefs, without authority, conveyed away the lands of their nation; and the body of the nation, with other chiefs at their head have determined to resist its execution. This is said to be the origin of the war. With the recollection, still fresh in our minds, of an undoubted violation of the national faith pledged by solemn treaty, to one of the Indian tribes within our borders, and with a knowledge of the general policy of our government towards all these tribes, we believe that what report says, is substantially correct. The precise facts may not be so, but there seems to be a general acquiescence in the opinion that there has been, in some shape, great injustice. Ask almost any man whom you meet, what is the cause of this Indian war, and he will tell you, injustice. The Indians are stung by a sense of wrongs which their savage nature prompts them to attempt to wash out with blood. What candid man will say that these Indian tribes would have entered into a war with a nation so superior to them in power,—a handful of men, in a single section of the country, against the whole white population of the United States,—if a policy founded in moderation, humanity, and equity, had been the unvarying policy of the European settlers of this continent, and of their descendants, in their intercourse with the Indian tribes? Yea more; who can believe that it has not been some particular act of injustice, some signal wrong, which, in the war in question, has so wrought up the savage passions?

Now with this Indian war we have nothing to do, except so far as it serves to illustrate our subject. It is not our business to complain of the policy of the government. But facts, we think we have a right to take, wherever we may find them, concern whom they may, whenever they contribute to shed light upon our cause. And what light do, what we have above as-

sumed to be facts, cast upon the alleged necessity of war? They show it most clearly to be a moral necessity, a necessity founded in the avarice, the ambition, the iniquities of men. Let governments renounce their romantic notions of honour, adopt, and act upon the principles of common honesty, and the main spring of the necessity of war is broken.

In the remarks which we have thus made, on occasion of commencing a second volume, our design has been to give some general illustration of the nature of the object to which our work is devoted. The first volume was occupied, chiefly, with the discussion of general topics. In the present volume, while such discussion will not be excluded, it is our intention to adopt more the method of illustrating general principles by particular incidents.

Imploring for both writer and reader, the influence of that Spirit who is able to guide into all truth, and to imbue the heart with peace, to Him we solemnly commit our cause.

ARTICLE II.

THE CAUSE OF PEACE DEMANDS THE SPECIFIC ATTENTION OF CHRISTIANS.

BY REV. L. F. HICKOK, LITCHFIELD, CONN.

IF war could be abolished, and peace universally secured, the combined voice of mankind would admit it were a consummation devoutly to be wished.

But notwithstanding this admission, to *some* the whole subject of peace is but an Utopian scheme. To *others*, who admit the truth of inspired prophecy, universal peace is something that will take place in some distant age, but like the beauty of a fair morning, or the blessings of a fruitful season, it will be the absolute gift of God, exclusive of all human agency. Some entirely despair of its accomplishment, and feel that war,